



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	4	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/653,229		08/31/2000	Thomas E. Saulpaugh	5181-6330	4610	
	7590	04/20/2004		ЕХАМП	NER	
Robert C k	Cowert		MANIWANG,	MANIWANG, JOSEPH R		
Conley Ros P O Box 39		on PC	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Austin, TX	-	-0398	2144			
				DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004	04 10	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

D

6 - 1						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Cummons	09/653,229	SAULPAUGH ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAIL INC DATE of this communication on	Joseph R Maniwang	2144				
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron e, cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 F	ebruary 2004.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This	s action is non-final.					
3)⊠ Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under I	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1,3-17,19-34 and 36-43 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,3-17,19-34 and 36-43 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ot	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 2144

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1, 3-17, 19-34, and 36-43 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of copending Application No. 09/693,673. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of

Art Unit: 2144

the current application are directed to a method and system employing a message gate that processes messages sent between a client and a service for verifying adherence to a data representation language schema and authentication credentials. The claims of copending App No. 09/693,673 are directed to a method and system for communicating messages between a client and a "respective paired message gate at another device", which included a service (see claim 1 and 8). This was achieved through a plurality of message gates configured for sending and receiving messages in a data representation language, and further configured to verify adherence to a data representation language schema and authentication credentials (see claims 2-7). Furthermore, both applications claim the use of XML (compare present claim 15 and App No. 09/693,673 claim 5). The present claims describing a message gate would have been obvious in light of the claims of App No. 09/693,673 since they describe a system with a plurality of such gates for performing similar functions. A system implementing a message gate unit as claimed would have been obvious in light of the claims describing a system with a plurality of such message gates.

2. This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments/Reasons for Allowance

Applicant's arguments, see Paper No. 9, filed 02/02/04, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 1-43 under 35 U.S.C 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The combination of the claimed limitations of

Art Unit: 2144

generating a message endpoint according to a data representation language schema defining a message interface using a subset of all messages that can be handled by the service in combination with the provision for client side verification of a message according to the data representation language schema and authentication of credentials attached to the message by the endpoint is not fairly taught or suggest by the prior art of record.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hill et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,511,197) disclosed a method and system for passing a pointer to an interface from a server process to a client process.

Mitchell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,356,933) disclosed a method for transferring application data between a client and a server in a markup language.

Wei (U.S. Pat. No. 5,701,415) disclosed a method for creating stub files with common procedure code, used for making remote procedure calls in a network.

Brown et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,736,321) disclosed a method for executing remote processes by establishing a message interface.

Box et al. ("Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) 1.1", W3C Note, 08 May 2000) disclosed a protocol for exchanging information in a distributed environment based on XML and encoding rules.

Art Unit: 2144

This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

A double patenting rejection made in the application of claims 1, 3-17, 19-34, and 36-43, as the claims are not patentably distinct from an invention claimed in a commonly owned patent with the same or a different inventive entity. A judicially created double patenting rejection may be obviated by filing a terminal disclaimer in accordance with § 1.321(c).

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex* parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO**MONTHS from the mailing date of this letter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph R Maniwang whose telephone number is (703) 305-3179. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack B Harvey can be reached on (703)305-9705. The fax phone number for the organization where this "application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2144

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JM

MARC D. THOMPSON

MRC THOMPSON

PRIMARY EXAMINER